```
1
 2
 3
 4
 5
6
7
                       UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
8
9
                       CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10
11
   GLOBAL ACQUISITIONS NETWORK,
                                     Case No. CV 12-08758 DDP (CWx)
   a Wyoming corporation; SHAWN
12
   CORNEILLE, an individual,
                                     ORDER TO SHOW CAUSE WHY THIS
                                     ACTION SHOULD NOT BE DISMISSED
13
                   Plaintiff,
                                     FOR FAILURE TO STATE A PLAUSIBLE
                                     CLAIM
14
        v.
   BANK OF AMERICA CORPORATION,
   a Delaware corporation;
16
   ORIANA CAPITAL PARTNERS, LLC,
   a Connecticut limited
   liability company; ZANCO, a
   company of unknown business
18
   form, HLB FINANCIAL, LLC, a
   company of unknown form; W/C
   INVESTMETN HOLDINGS INC., a
19
   Florida corporatin; DEXTER
20 CHAPPELL, an individual;
   VALERIE CHAPPELL, an
21
   individual; JON LEARY, an
   individual; GLEN McINERNEY
22
   also known as LARRY BENNETT,
   an individual; CHRISTOPHER
   RAY ZANCO, an individual;
   BERNARD WOODSON, an
2.4
   individual,
25
                   Defendants.
26
27
        As previously noted, the Court "has serious doubts about the
28
   plausibility of the scenario alleged by Plaintiffs" (Docket No. 38,
```

p. 6). Plaintiffs seek over \$31 million dollars in total damages based on pleaded facts that this Court seriously doubts actually occurred. (FAC, Docket No. 48. Specifically, the Court is dubious that anyone would agree, as Plaintiffs allege they did, to depart with something of high value based on oral representations made by an unknown individual over the phone. Further, though the "face value" of the CMOs is allegedly billions of dollars, they may in fact be worthless. Those doubts have not been alleviated through the course of the litigation. As a result, the Court has declined to enter a default judgment against any Defendant in this action. Further, Plaintiffs' counsel has requested and been granted withdrawal from this action, which adds to the Court's concern about the legitimacy of the underlying claims. (Docket No. 117.))

Therefore, the Court issues this order to Plaintiffs to show cause why this action should not be dismissed as implausible. Plaintiffs are ordered to file a brief, not to exceed five pages, by January 17, 2014, showing cause why this action should not be dismissed as implausible. The brief must be accompanied by a declaration attesting to the facts contained in the brief, signed under penalty of perjury. Failure to file a response will result in dismissal of this action with prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 27, 2013

DEAN D. PREGERSON United States District Judge